

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets (2, 3 and 6) of drawings include changes to Figures 3, 4 and 9 and replace the respective original sheets (2, 3, and 6) including Figures 3, 4 and 9. In Figures 3 and 4, the term "processing circuitry" has been added to box 60. In Figure 9, the term "switch" has been added to box 697 and the term "control logic" has been added to box 699. No new matter has been added to the application by these changes.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The drawings have been objected to because the Examiner is requiring the following changes: box 60 in Figures 3 and 4 must be labeled “processing circuitry”, box 697 in Figure 9 must be labeled “switch” and box 699 must be labeled “control logic.” By the present amendment, the drawings have been corrected as required by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 3, 4, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 20 have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 14-17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Douglas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,108).

In regards to claims 1, 2 and 5-8, claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the ground sensor includes a high impedance amplifier with a DC supply, a ground connection connected to both the first electrode and a universal ground, an input connected to the second ground electrode and an output connected to the local ground connection of the first signal sensor. The prior art applied reference of Douglas et al. does show a sensor 70 having an output 98. However, the output 98 is not connected to a local ground 95 of a first sensor. Therefore, the Douglas et al. reference does not anticipate amended claim 1 and its dependent claims.

In regards to claims 10, 11 and 14-17, claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 12 which have previously been considered allowable by the Examiner. In addition, all reference to the word “means” has been removed from claims 10-17. The Examiner has not treated these claims as being in means-plus-function format. Therefore, the word “means” has been removed to avoid any possible confusion and indicate that these claims should not be interpreted under § 112, sixth paragraph. Regardless, claim 12 has limitations analogous to claim 3 which has also been considered allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, claim 10 should now also be allowable. Claim 18 also was indicated as having allowable subject matter and has been amended to be placed

in independent form. Once again, the word "means" has been removed to avoid potential confusion. However, since the subject matter of claim 18 is analogous to claim 9, presumably claim 18 is now also allowable. Finally, the allowable limitations of claim 20 have now been incorporated into claim 19 and therefore, claim 19 should also be allowed.

Based on the above remarks, amendments to the claims and amendments to the drawings, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is patentably defined over the prior art of record such that allowance of all claims and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any additional questions or concerns regarding this matter, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below in order to further prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas Whitelaw
Nicholas S. Whitelaw
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,418

Date: September 26, 2008
DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC
12471 Dillingham Square, #301
Woodbridge, VA 22192
Tel: (703) 583-8300
Fax: (703) 583-8301